[6th August 1955

SRI S. NARSAPAYA :—" In view of the long pendency of cases, does the Government propose to make an addition to the High Court Judges at least on a temporary basis? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Perhaps the hon. member did not follow my answer in Tamil. I do not think there is any reason for increasing the number of Judges. On the other hand, we have given an undertaking that the next two vacancies which might be caused by retirement, we will not fill up."

DR. A. SREENIVASAN :—" In view of the fact that there are many cases pending, will the Government reconsider their decision regarding non-filling of these vacancies and at least appoint a few temporary Judges till these old cases are disposed of. though not on a permanent basis? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" It is in consultation with the Chief Justice that we have taken this decision and no representation has come from the Chief Justice of the High Court that there is any case for the increase in the number of judges. My own impression is that after these Original Side cases are transferred to the City Civil Court, there is relief as far as Original Side civil work is concerned and when the contemplated Bill for transferring the sessions work to a District Judge here is passed there will be 2 or 3 more Judges available to dispose of these appeals and other long pending cases."

DR. A. SREENIVASAN :—" After all there are only 278 Original Side cases and that is not a big number. The number seems to be very huge running to four digits in the case of first appeals, second appeals and civil revision petitions."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I am sorry the hon. Member is only a doctor. O.S.A. means Original Side appeals. The number of Original Side suits are not given here."

DR. V. K. JOHN :—" When do the Government contemplate to have the sessions work transferred from the High Court to the District Court? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The Bill for that purpose will be published very soon."

[Note.— An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—MESSAGE FROM THE ASSEMBLY.

3-20 p.m. MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I have to announce to the House that I have received the following message, dated the 6th August 1955, from the Hon. the Speaker, Madras Legislative Assembly :—

' In accordance with rule 138 of the Madras Assembly Rules, I transmit a copy of the motion passed to-day by the Madras Legislative Assembly, desiring to obtain the concurrence of the Council in setting up a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses to consider the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Bill, 1955 (L.A. Bill No. 11 of 1955):

6th August 1955] [Mr. Chairman]

MOTION.

"That the concurrence of the Legislative Council be obtained for setting up a Joint Select Committee of both the Houses consisting of 30 members (20 members of the Assembly and 10 members of the Council) to consider the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Bill, 1955, and that the following Members of this House be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee :—

(1) The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu.
(2) The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
(3) Sri K. Rajaram.
(4) " V. K. Ramaswamy Mudaliar.
(5) " S. Ramaswami Naidu.
(6) " P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.
(7) " P. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar.
(8) " V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.
(9) " Krishnaswami Padayachi.
(10) " Kattimuthu.
(11) Sri Chinnathambi Thevar.
(12) " T. V. Sannasi.
(13) " P. Ramamurthi.
(14) " C. Kandaswami.
(15) " K. R. Sambandam.
(16) " R. Rangaswami Gounder.
(17) " Nallasivam.
(18) " Palaniyandi.
(19) " D. Dasarathan.
(20) " K. Vinayakam."

III.—DISCUSSION ON THE DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXCESS EXPENDITURE FOR 1950-51.

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is rather very strange that there is a demand for appropriation of accounts for 1950–51, in the year 1955. I find that this is done on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. I think the Public Accounts Committee has done a very good service and we are grateful to it. I know human institutions are imperfect. But that there should have been so much overspending in 1950–51 which was not discovered till 1955 is a very strange thing. The reasons given for one item is : 'The expenditure was on the maintenance and repairs to minor irrigation works in the zamindari estates taken over by the Government. Provision for this special expenditure was omitted to be made by oversight. . .' I am wondering whether this 'oversight' reflects any credit to the department concerned. I have no doubt that the Hon. Finance Minister will see that every step is taken that this does not recur. But from the report of the Public Accounts Committee, we find that there has been a great delay in money matters and that there has been a lowering of standards. In the report of the Committee for the previous year, it is found that the Accountant-General drew the attention of the Committee to the audit objections and the amounts involved in them. The Committee was informed that as a result of the stringent instructions issued from time to time, considerable reduction has been made in the pendency of the objections and the Government continued to exercise close watch over the progress made in the clearance of the objections, taking suitable action against the officers responsible for the delay. I find that the Government have been very active and steps were taken. I do not know whether that state of things is continuing . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Considerable improvement has been made."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" In another portion it is stated that the Accountant-General has pointed out that notwithstanding the